

New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, Inc., New York corporation. Office: 100 N. York St., New York. Telephone: 100 N. York St., New York. Address: Tribune Building, No. 125 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily, 1 month, \$1.00; 3 months, \$2.50; 6 months, \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00.
Daily & Sunday, 1 month, \$1.50; 3 months, \$3.50; 6 months, \$6.50; 1 year, \$11.00.
Sunday only, 6 months, \$3.00; 1 year, \$5.00.

FOREIGN RATES—Daily, 1 month, \$1.50; 3 months, \$3.50; 6 months, \$6.50; 1 year, \$11.00.
Daily & Sunday, 1 month, \$2.00; 3 months, \$4.50; 6 months, \$8.00; 1 year, \$13.00.
Sunday only, 6 months, \$3.50; 1 year, \$6.00.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter.
You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for it is guaranteed to pay you money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

A Paper Army or a Real Army?

In his message to Congress last December President Wilson recommended the continental army scheme as an "essential first step" in military preparation. In his correspondence preceding Secretary Garrison's resignation he explained that his mind was still "open to conviction" as to the comparative merits of the continental army scheme and the Hay scheme of a more or less federalized national guard. Now, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, the possibility of keeping that open mind open any longer has vanished. As a third line of national defence the House offers the President a "federalized" national guard or nothing at all.

In our opinion the chief failing of the bill which the House Committee on Military Affairs is going to report is not that it discards the continental army plan for the nationalized militia plan. The former has been preferred to the latter by intelligent military critics, solely because it emphasized the necessity of complete national control over third line material as well as over second and first line material. There should be no division of authority in any branch of the military service between the Federal government and the state governments. Yet if we put a rational valuation on the state militia organizations, if we are willing to recognize the fact that they constitute only an eventual, partly trained reserve, not to be seriously reckoned with in our plans for a real first line army, the national guard, as reorganized under the Hay plan, might be about as useful practically as any similar under-trained, semi-amateur continental army.

In our view the House committee's plan of army reorganization criss not so much in what it does for the third line as in what it fails so conspicuously to do for the first line. So far as military efficiency goes, it puts the cart before the horse. Why give so much time, energy and money to building up reserves of dubious value while refusing to create an adequate mobile army equal to meeting the first shock of an invasion and a permanent organization capable of assimilating the bodies of half raw recruits which are to supply its wastage?

The increase which the House of Representatives is willing to make in the regular army is pitifully insufficient. It would enlarge the mobile army in continental United States from 25,000 to about 50,000. The mobile forces would be organized into three small and widely scattered divisions. But the recent report of the War College section of the General Staff shows that the minimum mobile army needed in continental United States ought to consist of 121,000 men, which total would furnish four divisions, organized on a modern basis. In handling these divisions the officers of the higher grades could get the sort of experience which would fit them for command in time of war.

Our military necessities, in the opinion of those best qualified to judge, require a permanent first line force under arms of 250,000. Why, then, palter and juggle with the situation, putting the country off with a cheap instalment plan increase, raising the total from 100,000, as at present, to 135,000?

The House bill contains various provisions for enlarging the officers' corps. The capacity of West Point is to be doubled and militia cadet battalions are to be created for the training of officers. But with an understated standing army these increases in the supply of officers defeat their own purpose. We can train cadets to be good lieutenants and captains. But their military education must cease when they become majors and colonels. We have no school of field service in which they can master their art further. The skill of the higher command is the real test of a modern army's efficiency, as the war in Europe has proved in every campaign. If we do not have a real army to serve as a training school for our officers in peace time, what can we expect to do in war with a conglomeration of untrained elements, hastily shaken together into divisions and armies?

The House has turned its back on reason and experience in submitting a lame and futile project of army reorganization—a reorganization on paper. The only hope of securing a real first line of defence now lies with the more alert and progressive Military Affairs Committee of the Senate.

Careful Scrutiny Needed.

It is to be hoped the failure of the Senate Finance Committee to report for confirmation Governor Whitman's nominees to the State Industrial Commission indicates a careful investigation of the fitness of the appointees. Charges of heavy import have been made against three of these men—Messrs. Lynch, Lyon and Wiard—growing out of the recent Williamsburg disaster. Those charges were turned over to the Industrial Council by the Governor for investigation, and a re-

port was made on the strength of which he nominated these gentlemen.

So far as the public is concerned, however, that report was not entirely convincing. The opinion in the council was not unanimous. Mr. J. Mayhew Wainwright, its chairman, was opposed to the exonerations of Messrs. Lynch, Lyon and Wiard, and failed to register his opposition by vote only because the law does not give a vote to the presiding officer of the council. Mr. Wainwright's position is bound to carry great weight, because he is known as a high-minded, intelligent public official, of unusual experience and unusually well informed regarding questions of the character involved.

The point of the controversy is that the public, in the face of everything presented up to date, cannot feel convinced that the charges of neglect of duty lodged against the three gentlemen named have been satisfactorily disproved. The Senate Finance Committee and the Senate itself should conduct a microscopic scrutiny of their record before confirming them for the places to which the Governor has named them.

"An Incapable Governor."

Elsewhere on this page to-day The Tribune prints some letters from readers expressing their opinion of Governor Whitman's experiment in "Teaching The Tribune." It believes the following extract from "The New Haven Journal-Courier" will also prove interesting:

Governor Whitman has never loomed up high on the horizon in the good old state of Connecticut. The impression we received of him as the District Attorney of New York was favorable, but the impression he has made as Governor of his state is so far different that the conclusion is forced that a capable District Attorney was destroyed to make an incapable Governor. The light in which The Tribune of that state reveals him makes even a worse impression. The Tribune has been warned by the Governor's secretary that unless its critical attitude is abandoned the state's advertising patronage will be taken from it. In addition to this, steps have already been taken to remove the public utilities commission, which has quarters in the Tribune Building, elsewhere, all part and parcel of a scheme to discipline the offending newspaper. Instead of developing at once a contrite spirit, the offensive Tribune takes the public into its confidence and tells the whole story without passion. The Tribune will be much better off without the patronage of the state, and its independence will be of a much more purified character. In the meantime "The Hartford Times" persistently inquires: "Will the politicians ever learn that a party paper may be honest, independent and fearless in the discharge of its duty to the public, and especially to its own party readers?" It is a cheap man who believes that his investment in advertising with a given newspaper is a part mortgage executed on his opinions.

The question remains to be answered: "Will the politicians ever learn?"

Up to Specifications.

We wonder whether the young woman who originally posed for the Venus de Milo enjoyed anything like the public attention now being showered upon Miss Margaret Willett, the Swarthmore junior, whose physical measurements are considered a duplication of those of the sculptor's model. Vaudeville managers, motion picture promoters, autograph seekers and would-be husbands, it is reported, have been deluged with the bewildered college girl by telegrams, letters and other messages of importunity ever since the publication of her statistics. Somehow, we have an idea that in those old days it took more than a set of physical measurements to convince a community of the beauty or histrionic capacity or matrimonial desirability of a daughter of the land. Helen of Troy was never measured, that we can recall, and it seems quite possible that if she had been there would have been revealed as so shocking discrepancies between her figure and that of our classic standard.

They put greater store by individuality in ancient times. Here in America we have become so accustomed to thinking alike and talking alike and dressing alike, and to purchasing our *lures* and *penates* by the catalogue from mail order houses, that some of us, a great, great many of us, in fact, have come to regard beauty and charm and personality as a matter of measurement and model. Hence the hysteria over a Venus de Milo with a college education, a young lady measuring up to the most advanced specifications both mental and physical—style A, No. 1, in any handsomely illustrated catalogue of the sex.

Poor Miss Willett! It must be a queer sensation to be desired for one's measurements.

Help for New York.

The bills introduced by Senator Brown affecting the finances of this city embody most of the recommendations of the legislative committee of which he was chairman which investigated financial conditions here. There can be no question of the wisdom of abolishing the Ludlow Street jail, abandoning the extravagant custom of paying Sheriff's fees to that official, giving the city control of the expenses of the Board of Water Supply, the Court House Board and the Public Service Commission, moving forward the date for tax payments and making the "pay-as-you-go" policy statutory.

It seems unfortunate that the Legislature deems it advisable to delay giving the local authorities power to fix all local salaries other than those of judicial and elective officials and also to fix county salaries. The referendum provision in these bills will bring up the question in such fashion and at such a time that it inevitably will be confused with political issues, a highly undesirable state of affairs. There ought to be no politics, no suspicion of politics, in this phase of city government. Taxpayers belong to all political divisions, and all suffer when the tax rate is unduly high. Nevertheless, the city, unable to do anything else, will take what the Legislature offers and endeavor to make the most of it.

New York City's good demands that these measures become law. It demands more far-reaching relief than these, how-

ever. One house of the Legislature has just adopted a bill apportioning \$10,000,000 of highway funds among upstate counties. There was no provision for any county within this city, and there is no disposition on the part of any of the state authorities to allot to this city any of the \$50,000,000, despite the justice of the city's claim. There is nothing in the course of the Legislature to date to show that it intends to abandon its annual custom of paying for building local bridges and cleaning out local creeks upstate chiefly at New York City's expense. All relief for this city cannot come through change of conditions here. There must be changes at Albany also, and some of them the legislative leaders seem to choose to ignore.

Male Births in Wartime.

The Registrar General's returns show that in thirty-six of the chief cities and towns of England and Wales there has of late been a steady increase in the male birth rate, as compared with the female. In the first quarter of 1915 the proportion was 1,032 boys to 1,000 girls; in the second quarter 1,043 to 1,000; in the third 1,055 to 1,000. The proportion of boys for the whole period is said to be the highest recorded in seventy years.

This discovery has been welcomed as serving to confirm the popular belief that nature provides for the waste of males in wartime, and some respectable names are used to back it. Thus Professor Halliburton, the physiologist, is said to have accepted the fact as established, observing that "we must look upon it as a wise dispensation of Providence." Likewise a biologist of good repute, Professor Arthur Dendy, is quoted as follows: "One cannot put down to mere coincidence the fact that male births preponderate during and after a war. Probably there is some natural law at present hidden from us which is responsible for this."

It is hardly credible that two men accustomed to weigh probabilities should accept a questionable theory on evidence so slight. If the reporter did not misunderstand them they must have had something more striking than the Registrar General's figures to convince them. The increase is so trifling that it is unnecessary to use far-fetched hypotheses to explain it. Moreover, the ratio of boys to girls may be unusual in the particular communities dealt with, but, generally speaking, it is not at all extraordinary. In fact, it is, if anything, below what is commonly accepted as the normal proportion. From the statistics of nearly 6,000,000 births it was estimated some years ago that the proportion was about 106 males to 100 females.

All sorts of theories have been formulated to account for various facts that have hardly been established with regard to male and female births, and one of the oldest is that war stimulates the production of males. This was a common belief long before there were any trustworthy vital statistics. It was simply a popular impression, which the Registrar General's figures fail to justify.

It must be a great relief to Mr. Wilson to feel that Lincoln's Birthday and Washington's Birthday are both past for this year. These comparisons are so unpleasant.

Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays are now "German crisis" days in Washington.

Mr. Wilson's Tariff Commission.

(From The Philadelphia Press.)
Mr. Wilson's advocacy of a tariff commission at this time is for election purposes only. He seeks to capitalize for himself a sentiment that exists in the country for such a body. He would give the name, but not the substance. The kind of a commission that he will appoint if Congress does his bidding is not at all what is wanted by those who are demanding the creation of such a body. It will not give them that for which they ask. It will be a sham and a mockery, and the hollowest of it will be very clear as time goes on. And Mr. Wilson has so poor an opinion of the intelligence of the American people as to think that they will not see the deception, but will believe that they have been given the genuine article.

He has no intention of giving to the country a real tariff commission, a body which will aid in the construction of a tariff law for the benefit of this country. He practically so states in what he says in the letter to Mr. Kitchin. Face to face with the knowledge that his tariff law is anathema in all parts of the United States, and that the voters are eager to pay their respects to the White House author of it, he now seeks to belaud the situation by his very tardy advocacy of a tariff commission. He hopes in this way to raise a fog, and to make the voters believe that through such commission all tariff mistakes can be rectified. But the scheme will not avail. It is too flimsy; through it can be seen his real motive. And that motive is to turn to his selfish political account the sincere sentiment there is in the country for a tariff commission, but not the kind that Woodrow Wilson would give. That kind would merely seek to perpetuate the present tariff misfit, that is neither a source of protection nor of revenue.

The Literary Output.

(From The Springfield Republican.)
Statistics compiled by "The Publishers' Weekly" of New York, show that the book production in this country last year was the smallest since 1908. The total number of books published in 1915, including pamphlets, was 9,734, as against 12,010 in 1914. The loss was due to the decrease in the number of importations, particularly from England, and to the unsettled trade conditions at home. The only classes of books which gained in 1915 were history, including war books, business and domestic economy. New editions of poetry and drama, however, held their own, falling only 1 point behind the record of the previous year. In spite of the greatly increased interest in poetry and the new form of verse, the number of new books in this class fell from 647 to 487. Fiction leads all the classes in the number of new books produced, but in 1914 religion led, with sociology and economics a close second. Fiction was only third in the number of new books published, though it led by a slight margin in the combined number of new books and new editions. No doubt it was far in the lead in the number of copies sold. In spite of the decline in figures there is no prospect of a shortage in new books, and there is no lack of editions—even cheap editions—of the classics for the man who believes that whenever a new book comes out it is preferable to read an old one.

"IF BELGIUM MADE PEACE"

A Possibility Involving a Calamity for the World.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The discussion by Mr. Simonds in The Tribune of to-day points out the possibility, almost the likelihood, that Belgium may make a separate peace with Germany. I am appalled at such an idea and cannot conceive such a calamity as that coming to the world. As well believe that the violated nuns of Aerschot, if they could come back from their graves, would rush into the arms of their despoilers.

In all recorded history no people have stood on so high a plane of honor and in its defence showed such infinite and persistent courage as have the Belgians. "Tout est perdu fors l'honneur"; and shall they now, deliberately, and of their own will, forfeit all that's left—their honor? Forbid it, Almighty God!

We must hate those whom we have most wronged, and to the hate of Germany for Belgium makes it utterly impossible to believe she would suggest such a peace unless she had become sure that otherwise she would be forced, very soon, to ask for merciful terms for herself. And a special horror at the prospect is that thereby Belgium would become Germany's mightiest ally against the Allies who had spent an infinity of life and treasure in her defence.

If Belgium, for the sake of some small easement, can take money from those who raped her daughters as well as her country, and maintain neutrality as against France and England, then by that act she would release Germany from the need of offence against France, and would release the Western troops and would double the German army for more easterly work.

It would be better than sending her two million soldiers. I cannot believe it possible that from her loftiest height of nobility she should descend into the lowest pit of degradation; humbly fall, willingly, into German arms, surrender her everlasting glory of the last twenty months, and become, suddenly, instead of the soul of honor, the soul of shame.

Unthinkable it should be and is to every lofty soul who gives thanks to heaven that Belgium and Albert have equalled Thermopylae and Leonidas and proved that to maintain the sanctity of treaties and of honor they would "play out the game" even to the point of their own extermination.

After the first violation of the eighty-year-old treaty, and its succeeding horrors, it cannot be that any sane Belgian could put any trust of any sort in any treaty or promise Germany might offer. Just one more "scrap of paper." Nothing is so certain as that Germany has forfeited every claim to be trusted by any people, even her own. Brazen in her arrogance, ruthless in every detail, utterly false to promises and treaties, it ought to be seen that the proposed separate peace with Belgium is nothing but a war trick to do greater harm to the despoiled Allies.

Upon sanctity of treaty Belgium took her splendid stand against Germany, and so she simply cannot now herself break that same treaty without complete assent of her Allies; that would cast her down almost to the level of Germany.

If Belgium shall sink into such a slough, through despair, it will in great degree be chargeable to the dreadful neglect of the government of the United States either to say one word of manly protest or to do one act in her behalf. If the Belgian is to become infamous, much of that infamy will rest upon America.

Our present cessation of diplomatic relations with Germany (I urged it nine months ago) would soon end the idea of a treasonous special peace with Belgium. It would give new life to Belgium and her admirers, and would restore self-respect to Americans, and sound the knell of "Prussianism."

JOSEPH CULBERTSON CLAYTON.
Brooklyn, Feb. 13, 1916.

Democracy vs. Autocracy.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: In his article of Sunday, February 13, Mr. Simonds suggests the possibility of the termination of the war by autumn, should Belgium accept the terms offered her by Germany. Does not Mr. Simonds neglect one very important point? The grounds for the continuation of the war are not the same as the motives which started it. Belgium is no longer fighting merely to defend her neutrality, or to regain her former integrity; France is not striving to prevent an invasion of her territory; England does not imagine that she is at war to restore Belgium to her original state. The conflict now is to preserve the advantages of democracy against the menace of autocracy.

Peace to-day would spell "victory" for Germany. To the German people, educated for years in the belief that they are victims of the hatred of treacherous enemies, a treaty of peace would immeasurably strengthen the government which had (for them) so successfully guided them through the war. But the government itself would it lightly set aside that ambition which led it to precipitate this great war? Would it easily forget the sting of its temporary failure to attain its object? Hardly. Rather would it become even more far-sighted, more wary, than it has been. Backed by the enthusiastic support of a now undivided people, instead of being hampered by the growing socialistic party, what achievements would not be possible!

Whatever the advantages of democracy, on the other hand, singleness of purpose is not one of them. That very freedom of the individual for which democracy stands, the opportunity for the expression of particular interests in the government, militates against efficiency such as that attained by an intelligent autocracy. Yet there seems little doubt that, politically, the net result of the war among the Allies will be a still further extension of the principle of democracy.

Who can believe, then, that Belgium, France or England could conclude a peace which would so perpetuate and strengthen the menace living among them—a nation inherently strong by reason of its autocratic form of government, supported by its people, and nursing ambitions destructive to national individuality and to the attainment of the democratic ideal?

Again the safety of the world may depend on the action of valiant little Belgium. Let us hope and pray that she will again prove herself worthy of our highest admiration and deepest gratitude.

A. W. LAHEE.
Albany, N. Y., Feb. 15, 1916.

King Peter's Discourse.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I would thank you for that vital prose poem by King Peter of Serbia in your issue of to-day.

Is there no artist who will build it for us in poignant, potent music?

DAISY SANIAL GILL.
Douglaston, Long Island, Feb. 12, 1916.

ANOTHER "GRAVE CRISIS."



NEW YORK'S HUMANITY TO CHILDREN

A Boston Investigator Pays His Tribute to Our Suppression of the Abuses of Adoption and Baby Farming—The Situation Here Far Better Than It Is in New England.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: When a blunder is huge enough, it becomes magnificent—or at any rate dignified—so it is without shame that I report my descent upon New York the other day to demolish a traffic in babies that does not exist there, whereas in New England—let me cite instances.

In the Charlestown State Prison there is at present a degenerate negro whose white foster child, a girl of nine, had been subjected to unprintable abuse. When she was a baby he got hold of her by answering one of those harmless-seeming advertisements in a highly reputable Boston daily. As the law makes no provision for an investigation before the Probate Court sanctions an adoption, such calamities are not only possible, they occur. If the negro has a white wife, the arrangement is easy. She sees it through while he keeps in the background.

In Shawmut Avenue, one of Boston's disgraced streets, there is a card reader and clairvoyant who for years has been systematically following up advertisements of infants for adoption. She never adopts a baby, never promises to. Her object, unless inferences from fairly outspoken circumstances are as mistaken as they are natural, is to gain a grip on unmarried mothers and draw them into the white slave trade.

As for serious applicants—those in earnest about adopting a baby—a considerable proportion want money—\$1,000 is the fee usually asked. One demand went as high as \$4,000. Obviously, people coarse enough to stoop to this sort of thing are unfit to be intrusted with an infant's future. It is a kind of blackmail. Some observers go the length of concluding that there are professional baby-makers who make a business of adopting babies, passing them on, and adopting more. This is guesswork, of course; but within the last fortnight there appeared in a Boston newspaper an advertisement by a couple who "for remuneration" would "take a child."

All these things have been exposed. For two years and a half a committee of Boston experts in child saving obtained from the clipping bureau the adoption advertisements printed in Massachusetts papers. After investigating four hundred cases, the committee's secretary, Mr. Carrington Howard, published the results in the Survey. That has not stopped the advertisements.

It need hardly be added that the majority of the babies offered are unfit for adoption. Some, though apparently white, have negro blood. Many are the offspring of feeble minded mothers. Some have inherited the most baffling and abominable of all diseases. Yet every few days comes an appealing announcement, worded in some such style as this: "For adoption: Blue-eyed baby girl, three months, perfect health."

Now, while blackmail—or its less brutal equivalent—uses the Massachusetts newspapers, it also takes advantage of maternity homes. In Boston, recently, an unmarried mother paid \$40 to have an adoption arranged. The foster mother also paid \$40. Two days after the child's birth came a doctor, making his first visit to the mother and collecting \$25. When she protested, he brought her to terms by threatening to expose her in the New England village from which she had come.

Occasionally, however, things rather fine—as concerns motive, at least—occur in maternity homes. For example, instances where the father of an illegitimate child will voluntarily pay \$1,000 to finance its adoption. Nevertheless, there remains the question as to who adopts the baby. When a maternity home makes a business of exploiting unmarried mothers it is not safe to imagine that the people who run it are in a position to find suitable foster-parents or particularly conscientious about trying to. I have seen "All Babies Adopted" printed on the stationery of a professionally reputable maternity home in Connecticut.

In baby boarding establishments—"baby farms," as you call them in New York—it is sometimes less a question of adoption than of infanticide. The recent alleged revelations by the Maryland Vice Commission, sensational and all but incredible though they were—"burial mounds" and that sort of thing

were hardly more fantastic than the actual conditions discovered several years ago by Miss Mary Boyle O'Reilly in baby farms in New Hampshire just over the state line from Massachusetts. It is not difficult to kill an infant. Nor is the motive far to seek. When a baby-farmer accepts a lump-sum of \$50 and lets the mother disappear; or when the mother pays the child's board weekly for a time and then vanishes and cannot be traced, it is cheaper to kill the baby than to go on feeding it.

Do you wonder that facts like these, vouched for by the secretaries of the Boston S. P. C. C., the Children's Aid Society, the Children's Friend Society and two officials of the Massachusetts State Board of Charities, seemed to indicate a condition probably as serious in New York as in New England? My late foray (or fiasco, if you prefer) was suggested by a distinguished editorial writer who recently rounded out fourteen years in New York City. It was encouraged by a New York daily and watched with expectant interest by a widely informed sociologist connected with the Children's Bureau at Washington, which is conducting an extensive investigation of illegitimacy and, although no conclusions are as yet definitely announced, has turned up sufficient data to give more than a mere local importance to what has come to light in New England. Evidently, then, the magnificent child-saving work going on in New York City is sadly unknown to outsiders, shamefully unknown to most New Yorkers.

New York State has laws that bear down heavily upon any one who attempts to get rid of a baby. There must be an appearance before constituted authorities. Under penalty, there must be a satisfactory explanation. This puts a stop to adoption advertisements in the newspapers—or with exceedingly rare exceptions it does. They invite official interference, at once thorough and severe. Several years ago such advertisements occurred in German-American newspapers. The authorities quickly ended it. As for printing "All Babies Adopted" on the stationery of a maternity home anywhere in New York State, it would be madness.

The greatest friend of New York City's babies, however, is the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. Most New Yorkers seem to imagine that it busies itself mainly with bothering chorus girls who cannot prove that they are sixty years old. Others think it is merely an organization that avenges crimes against children. Drop in some day, and see.

They will show you the chamber of horrors, which is something like a hardware shop and something like an arsenal—cramped with knives, hatchets, scissors, and even firearms that have been used on child victims. They will show you the innocents' gallery, with its photographs of poor, abused little wretches still bleeding. But the thing they show proudly is the file of baby-farm documents. In New York City every baby-farm must be licensed by the Board of Health, and the board immediately reports it to the S. P. C. C., which investigates minutely and keeps an eye on that baby-farm ever after. Not in the German army itself is efficiency carried to a higher perfection. This prevents any possible abuse of the babies. It affords relief to the baby-farmers in case of trouble. If a mother stops payment and disappears, the baby-farmer brings the infant to the S. P. C. C. New England means well, on the whole. For the things done officially in Massachusetts I have a respect amounting to admiration. And yet, with the law as it is, adoption advertisements continue, and with the system as it is, there are abuses that escape official notice until too late, not only in Massachusetts but in other sections of New England.

By comparison New York City shines. It is what a friend of mine called it, far and away "the best baby town." I can only apologize for suspecting it of maintaining a traffic in babies. It is a town where, if you pick up sick or crippled infants, as a couple in Eighty-first Street are doing, the doorbell rings every few minutes and an authorized inspector pops in, looking for trouble; you are spied on, hounded. Don't imagine I regret the personal experience of coming over to New York with fire in my heart and blood in my eye and finding nothing to attack, though I see the colossal joke of it. In a less solemn mood than the present, I could say, "Brethren, the burrs are on me. Words fail me to tell how many."

ROLLIN LYNDE HARTT.
Brookline, Mass., Feb. 12, 1916.

"TEACHING THE TRIBUNE"

Governor Whitman's Effort to Muzzle Honest Criticism.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I read with a great deal of interest the editorial in your issue of the 18th inst., entitled "Teaching The Tribune," and was very much surprised to think that Mr. Whitman would stoop to do what your editorial states he did. Verily, "politics makes strange bed fellows."

As a commercial traveller of thirty years' experience, covering the greater part of New York State periodically, I took a great deal of pleasure in advocating Mr. Whitman's election to the Governorship, basing my efforts on his success and zeal while he was District Attorney. In view of recent events and his "Teaching The Tribune," should Mr. Whitman be a candidate again for any office, my efforts would be in the opposite direction.

I suggest that as a number of your readers may not have seen the editorial above referred to, you reprint it for, say, a week, so that all your readers may know what you have to encounter in trying to publish a recent newspaper. I am placing the editorial before my friends, and it may result in something.

F. W. WALKER.
New York, Feb. 19, 1916.

Criticism a Duty.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In view of the attempt of the Governor of this state to punish The Tribune for its criticism of his official acts, it would seem to be the duty of the readers of this paper to take the matter in hand. Every Republican voter has a right to demand from his party paper the whole truth and impartial criticism of official acts. He requires correct information on official acts in order that he may vote intelligently.

A paper that does not criticize public officials of its own party as freely as it would the officials of another party fails in its duty to its readers and the public. Hence The Tribune was simply doing its duty when it criticized certain acts of the Governor, and its readers should take some steps to resist this contemptible exercise of official tyranny.

Brooklyn, Feb. 21, 1916. W. H. ALLEN.

Confidence Repaid.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Thank Heaven for an honest man on an honest newspaper. Your editorial of Friday, February 18, "Teaching The Tribune," was a joy to my soul. For thirty years I have been a reader of The Tribune and was sadly hurt when I saw the way Charles Whitman was deceiving you during the John Doe investigation.

However, I never lost faith in you, and am now repaid for my confidence.

E. M. BURNS.
Newark, N. J., Feb. 21, 1916.

Strong Approval.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I wish to congratulate The Tribune on securing a worthy successor to the late Dr. Devins in the religious news department of the paper. The Rev. Charles A. Welch is doing fine work. His articles on Saturdays have been most timely and suggestive and are read with interest by the people of New York and vicinity.

Your "Go to Church" posters are calculated to do much good, and I am sure your effort in behalf of churchgoing is appreciated by all who are interested in the welfare of humanity. The man who writes these posters is a "wise man" and a "good cheerer."

JAMES H. HOADLEY.
New York, Feb. 19, 1916.

Thanks and Appreciation.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I wish to congratulate The Tribune on securing a worthy successor to the late Dr. Devins in the religious news department of the paper. The Rev. Charles A. Welch is doing fine work. His articles on Saturdays have been most timely and suggestive and are read with interest by the people of New York and vicinity.

Your "Go to Church" posters are calculated to do much good, and I am sure your effort in behalf of churchgoing is appreciated by all who are interested in the welfare of humanity. The man who writes these posters is a "wise man" and a "good cheerer."